

Pakistan in building a sophisticated nuclear arsenal. Unfortunately, this arsenal is not subject to international inspection.

In fact, the administration continues to look the other way as China continues to exploit technology and ballistic and missile components to Pakistan. I would like to remind my colleagues that Pakistan is not a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency and bans investigators from several of its nuclear facilities.

Mr. Speaker, why is the administration willing to grant certification? Eight days ago, the Chinese Prime Minister signed regulations that would limit the export of nuclear technology. Is the administration satisfied that 8 days is the sufficient amount of time to show China's commitment to change its practices for the last 12 years? I certainly do not think so.

Nuclear proliferation experts are concerned as to whether the Chinese Government even has the ability or is willing to enforce these regulations.

Mr. Speaker, United States officials have expressed concern that the upcoming China-United States summit, which is supposed to take place later this month, would be a failure if there is not some positive development in our trade relations. And this is particularly true since the process of including China in the World Trade Organization may not be completed by the time of the summit.

The idea, from what I can gather, is that the U.S. certification regard to nuclear technology exports would somehow salvage the summit. But this, I would submit, is the wrong reason for granting certification.

Is the upcoming summit so important, Mr. Speaker, essentially, that we, as Members of this body, should be willing to compromise the United States position on nuclear proliferation and grant China this certification? I do not think so. I think that is an inappropriate way to proceed.

Members of this body have supported and at times insisted that China receive United States peaceful nuclear technology only if China halts all nuclear exports to nations with unregulated nuclear facilities. Earlier this year, a letter was sent to President Clinton by Members of Congress stating that China has not earned or behaved in a manner which warrants such certification.

Mr. Speaker, basically, I am asking, and I hope that many of my colleagues will insist, that the administration change its mind and not grant the certification to China. I am not willing to compromise the United States position on nuclear proliferation simply to appease the Chinese Government in this upcoming Sino-United States summit. I think it is the wrong way to proceed, and hopefully many of us in Congress will continue to insist that we not proceed in that direction.

#### U.S. DOES NOT FUND ABORTIONS WITH TAXPAYER DOLLARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, the House cast a very important vote today on a motion to instruct on the foreign operations bill, a motion to instruct the conferees not to recede from the language which was inserted in the amendment on the House floor on that bill, language which says simply that when in that bill we spend money for population control abroad, that money cannot be spent or given to organizations that procure or counsel abortions.

Now, it seems to me the basic issue with this kind of language is as follows: We do not fund abortions here in the United States with taxpayer dollars. We certainly should not use taxpayer dollars to fund abortions abroad. There are two very important reasons for this.

In the first place, whatever our divisions may be on this very contentious issue, we all basically accept, a vast majority of people in this country accept, that our public policy should, at minimum, discourage abortion. The vast majority of the people believe it is an evil even if there are many people who believe it is a necessary evil.

If we say something is an evil, we do not subsidize it, we do not spend the taxpayer dollars on it. We may believe very passionately it should not be outlawed, but that does not mean we want to encourage people to do it. That is the policy we follow here within the borders of the United States. We should follow a policy at least no less vigorous with regard to the money that we send abroad.

There is another issue. There are millions of Americans, and I am one of them, who believe as a deep matter of conscience that abortion is wrong, that if anything is wrong, abortion is wrong. Out of respect for them, as well as because we want to discourage that practice, we do not take their money which they pay in taxes to support their Government and use it to fund abortions here in our borders in the United States. Out of a similar respect for them, we should not take their money and spend it on abortions in other countries.

It was a very important vote. I was very pleased that the House, by a margin that was actually larger than the one which the House originally adopted this language called the Mexico City language, The House instructed its conferees not to recede from it.

One other point that I want to make with regard to this, Mr. Speaker, it is an important one, and it is one I think we may actually have some agreement on. Everyone here is concerned that we not stall the whole foreign operations bill because of this dispute, as important as it is, that only relates to a particular part of it.

I could not agree more. We should not hold up the whole foreign operations bill because the House and the Senate cannot agree on this language. I do not know why the Senate will not at least try to pass the bill over in the Senate with language saying, we do not fund abortions here, we are not going to fund it abroad. If that is their position, we ought not to let the whole bill go down because of that.

It is very simple to prevent that from happening, whether it is simply resolved in the conference committee that this measure is going to be worked out in a separate bill on the authorization bill. And at that point, we can free up the rest of the foreign operations bill, the aid to Israel, the other things that are important, and pass that.

That is the position I hope the House continues to take, Mr. Speaker, first of all, that we do not use taxpayer dollars to fund abortions here in the United States. We are certainly not going to do so abroad. We understand that the Senate and others have sincere and deep disagreements about that. We are not going to let those disagreements hold up the foreign operations bill.

None of us are going to go have to recede from positions that we hold as a matter of honor. We will simply agree we will not hold up that bill, we will fight it out in another venue. That is the position I hope the House takes. I think it was a courageous vote today, Mr. Speaker. I hope we continue it in the weeks ahead as we work toward the adjournment.

#### TRIBUTE TO WADE STEVENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my remarks tonight to the Stevens family of Bay St. Louis, MS, Sue Stevens, but in particular Eric and Laura Stevens, two young people who lost their dad recently.

I can only imagine how horrible it is for a child to lose their mom and dad. And I know that nothing I can say or do can lessen your sorrow. But I want you to know and I want the people of our Nation to know that I think your dad was a hero.

□ 2230

For his courage and his compassion and his unselfishness, he should be, and he will be, remembered.

Just a few weeks ago, Eric and Laura's dad was diagnosed with an aneurysm in his brain and he was told that he required surgery to correct it. Their dad, Wade Stevens, told a coworker, Deb Sellier, that should things go bad that he wanted her husband to have his heart. Deb's husband, Dave Sellier, is a retired St. Louis policeman who was medically retired because of a heart condition a few years back. He has